DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 229 SO 013 745

TITLE	Project Director's Report: Alternatives in Social Science Education, 1978-1980.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, Flushing, N.Y. Queens Coll.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
GRANT	SER-78-12094
NOTE	34p.: Some pages are of a light print type and may not reproduce clearly from EDRS in microfiche or paper copy.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Information Dissemination; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Materials; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; *Social Sciences; *Social Studies; Surveys; *Teacher Workshops; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the teacher workshop described in this report was to disseminate information to junior and senior high school social studies classroom teachers and administrators regarding innovative educational materials and teaching methods available in social science disciplines. Forty-seven social studies teachers and administrators from New York City area schools, participated in the program. The program consisted of one-day long presentations in 1979 on anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, and psychology and additional full-day conferences devoted to each of these disciplines scattered throughout the following year. Presentations were offered by teams consisting of a social scientist, an experienced teacher consultant, and the project director (a social science educator). Workshop participants were involved in a wide variety of activities, including viewing and analyzing social science topics, evaluating various teaching techniques and materials (including major texts, projects, and National Science Foundation sponsored programs in the social sciences). Pre- and posttest workshop surveys were undertaken to determine teachers' and administrators' familiarity with social science materials, willingness to try new materials and methods in the classroom, projected success in implementing new ideas (pre-workshop survey), and impact of the workshop on participants (follow-up surveys). Findings indicated that teachers and administrators possessed little familiarity with innovative social studies materials at the beginning of the workshop and that most teachers demonstrated an increase in awareness, familiarity, and intent to use new materials and teaching methods as a result of participation in the workshop. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210229

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Batts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S REPORT: ALTERNATIVES IN SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

1978-1980.

SO 013 745

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

To
The

National Science Foundation
Information Dissemination in Science Education Program

For

The Queens College Project
Alternatives in Social Science Education

1978-1980

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Participants	3
III.	Program	5
IV.	Assessment	8
	A. Overview	8
	B. Survey Results	10
	C. Follow-Up Interviews	16
V.	Conclusions	25
VI.	Interview Schedule	27

I. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the Spring and Fall of 1979 fifty key social studies teachers* and administrators participated in an information dissemination workshop designed to increase awareness of the many alternatives open to secondary social studies teachers in their choice of social science programs representing the fields of anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, and psychology. The program was arranged in blocks of presentations each devoted to a different discipline with additional full day conferences scattered throughout the year and in late June of 1979. The full day conference often involved interdisciplinary presentations designed to strengthen participants' familiarity with those scientific methods common to all of the social sciences. It would be fair to say that the philosophy and methodology of the social sciences was an underlying theme-coupled with problem-solving teaching techniques- that ran through the entire program and was reinforced by the staff of educators and social scientists.

Each discipline was represented by a team including a social scientist, an experienced teacher consultant, and the project director, a social science educator. The entire staff met several times during the year for general planning and feed-back while the subject-matter teams met much more frequently to develop lessons for each meeting (meetings were bi-monthly for a year). Because of the frequent planning sessions and because this was the second year of the project,

*3 eventually dropped out or did not complete the project.

the staff had coalesced in purpose and the program showed superior organization as compared to the first year. As much attention was paid to pedagogical concerns as to those of formal social science with a view to more closely involving teachers in the materials--after which involvement developed into more general inquiries into the methods and concepts of the social sciences. Teacher consultants, each of whom was especially well-versed in one or more of the programs and texts utilized, added significantly to discussions by offering classroom anecdotes, reporting on the advantages and/or disadvantages of a particular curriculum, and by frequently leading demonstration lessons (sometimes with groups of secondary school students) to the group as a whole.

II. PARTICIPANTS

A very strong group (in terms of interests and background) of fifty participants was selected from 190 New York area applicants. The median age of the group was 43 with an average of eighteen years teaching experience. Eight department chairpersons and three assistant principals were among the group, while three of the teachers were responsible for curriculum coordination in their districts. In addition, two local board of education members were accepted into the program. All but three participants represented teams of two or more from individual schools or school districts. Only three teachers dropped out during the year and a half of the project.

Thus, the group represented a mature and experienced set of educators, many of whom held decision-making roles in their schools or districts and were in a position to influence curriculum choices. Excellent attendance and the relatively low dropout level indicates considerable enthusiasm for, and interest, in studying alternatives to the social studies curriculum. Over-all, the project does appear to have fulfilled its goal of recruiting key teachers and administrators who have considerable teaching experience and were ready for a re-training and "awareness" experience.

It should be noted that a very high proportion of workshop participants (75%) were motivated to join the program because of an expressed need to "revitalize" their teaching and courses in the school and that many (46%) learned of the program by word of mouth through their administrators or

through colleagues from the area who had been previously enrolled in an NSF-sponsored workshop. Quite a few (34%) were from departments or districts in which key social studies personnel have previously been in attendance, thus lending strong support to the strategy for recruiting participants in teams that include one or more administrators or parent leaders. One of the weaknesses in recruiting was the lack of contact with PTA leadership, since only four PTA people applied and two finally enrolled. Administrator, especially chairperson, responses were, however, very strong and supportive of the project both in its planning and implementation stage.

III. PROGRAM

Bi-monthly and full-day sessions were devoted largely to demonstrations and analyses of curricula that typify the effort to introduce social science content and methodology into the social studies. Particular attention was paid to major projects funded by the National Science Foundation including these:

Anthropology Curriculum Study (MacMillan)
Exploring Human Nature (EDC)
Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (Allyn & Bacon)
Economics in Society (Addison-Wesley)
American Political Behavior (Ginn)
and
Comparing Political Experiences (Allyn & Bacon)

In addition, several well-known psychology texts, such as Weitherimer's Psychology: A Brief Introduction and McKeachie's Psychology: The Short Course. were used to illustrate the kind of materials available to teachers of psychology in the high school.

Time did not permit a full examination of any of the programs, so selections were made from each for demonstration at the workshop meetings with the participants. Involvement was part and parcel of each meeting with the stress laid upon playing the role of active learners rather than pedagogues. An example of this would be the October evening on which the participants conducted their own survey of political attitudes toward U.S. government symbols and offices such as the flag, the national seal, the president, etc. using activity cards and workbook sheets provided with the American Political Behavior program. Another example

would be the Stereotyping lesson from the SRSS project's episode, IMAGES OF PEOPLE, in which our workshop group first reacted to pictures of high school-age girls, then reacted to their names, and then to background information. In addition to demonstrating an important piece of the sociology program, this lesson was used to illustrate social science techniques, scientific procedures of investigation, and statistical methods of analysis.

Demonstrations were regularly followed or accompanied by discussions of their background, meaning, and related research drawn from the relevant social science discipline. Scholarly research questions and problems were usually handled by one of the social science colleagues attached to the project. Dissemination of social science curricula was further enhanced by the contributions of teacher consultants who reviewed larger portions of the program for participants and who gave anecdotal accounts of the project's (and/or specific lesson's) effects on their own classes in secondary school settings. In addition, individuals in the workshop were given the task of writing brief but comprehensive reviews of units, chapters, episodes, etc. within each program discussed and analyzed. These reviews were shared either in writing, or were presented orally and discussed during several of our evening sessions.

The combination of specific demonstration of 'typical' lessons, academic background, social science methodology, and broader review, was designed to give both breadth and

depth to the workshop's dissemination efforts. Materials were also loaned to participants for their own, more thorough, personal study and classroom application. Where feasible, a few classroom sets of SRSS episodes, ACSP units, and APB workbooks were loaned for field testing to teachers who agreed to experiment and report on their experiences with the materials in one or more of their classes.

IV. ASSESSMENT

A. Overview

Special attention was paid to the pre- and post-workshop awareness and implementation that teachers and administrators exhibited of alternative social science materials in anthropology, sociology, economics, political science and psychology. A survey instrument listing a sample of the major texts, projects, and NSF sponsored programs in the social sciences was presented for participants' reactions. Each was requested to indicate awareness, degree of familiarity, and use, of a wide variety of materials. In addition, open spaces were alloted so teachers and administrators could include favorite materials outside those already presented on the list or included in the workshop program. Further, a trained observer was directed to visit and interview (by telephone or in person) a sample of participant classrooms and to question in depth at least a few teachers concerning the materials and methods they were currently using to teach social studies. This was done to supplement results of the paper and pencil survey with more objective and/or direct observation of field situations. Thus, a cross-check was devised to develop a more realistic picture of classroom usage and project impact upon teachers several months removed from contact with the project.

At the first workshop session, all participants

were asked to respond to two surveys; the first, a brief one, asked what they expected or wanted to achieve during the program. This was a question of goals and expectations that resulted in an overwhelming expression of desire for "revitalization" or an "opening" to new ideas concerning what could be done to revise or expand social studies courses. Prominent, but less frequently mentioned were expectations of enhanced professionalism, the need for credits to improve salary benefits, planning to set up new electives within the department, and a desire to meet and exchange ideas with colleagues from different schools. These rankings were based on a content analysis of the frequency of responses to the open question mentioned above concerning expectations and needs from the **NSF workshop.**

While the many of the responses fit the usual pattern of answers to in-service programs, the extremely strong demand for revitalization indicates a deep need by career teachers for professional growth coupled with a relative lack of available, quality in-service training. There appears to be a very powerful urge among many social studies teachers in the New York area to seek something new and different from their usual programs and course offerings preferably in a highly professional, university/college based context. I and my staff feel that this is a sign of health on the part of the experienced teaching staff to whom our program appealed for support and participation; a willingness to

to give valuable time and energy for learning (in rather low-morale education period) that should be recognized and widely encouraged.

A second survey focused on knowledge rather than needs. This survey asked participants to indicate their degree of familiarity with and/or use of a list of nationally disseminated programs and texts designed to offer one or more of the social sciences to a pre-college student audience. The list shown below presents several programs/texts in each social science category for reaction; and leaves open response areas for participants to fill in with the titles and authors of materials they were currently using or favored using with their own students.

B. Survey Results

Relatively little awareness or familiarity in the pre-workshop survey was shown with the social science projects on the list. (as shown in the Table one on the following page) Use was extremely low for the group of participants though nearly all are experienced teachers of considerable motivation and education. Much greater awareness, familiarity, and use was indicated for the teacher supplied entries in each social science category. Most commonly mentioned in terms of 'new' social studies programs were units and books of the Fenton program developed at Carnegie-Mellon and published by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, (40% awareness, 28% familiarity, 20% use in classrooms). Frequent listings were given for a variety of textbooks and review books

N=50 (responses in numbers of teachers)

Subjects & Programs	Degree of Awareness ("heard of, seen")				Degree of Familiarity ("Read, examined")				Degree of Use ("in class")			
	NONE	SLIGHT	SOMEWHAT	VERY	NONE	SLIGHT	SOMEWHAT	VERY	NONE	SLIGHT	SOMEWHAT	VERY
Anthropology												
"Anthropology Curriculum Study"	50	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	50	-	-	-
"Exploring Human Nature"	49	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	-
Other	50	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	50	-	-	-
Economics												
"Economics in Society"	49	1	-	-	49	1	-	-	50	-	-	-
"Topics in Economics (JCCE)"	47	3	-	-	47	3	-	-	48	2	-	-
Other	-	3	5	-		3	5	-	-	2	4	-
Political Science												
"American Political Behavior"	47	1	1	1	47	1	1	1	47	1	1	1
"Comparing Political Experience"	50	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	50	-	-	-
Other												
Psychology												
"Introduction to Psychology"	48	1	1	-	48	1	1	-	48	1	1	-
"Psychology: A Short Course"	48	1	1	-	48	1	1	-	48	1	1	-
Other	-	7	5	3	-	6	4	3	-	5	3	1
Sociology												
"Sociological Resources for the Social Studies"	45	3	2	-	46	2	2	-	47	2	1	-
a. "Inquiries in Sociol Sociology"	49	1	-	-	49	1	-	-	50	-	-	-
b. "Episodes in Sociology"	45	2	2	1	46	2	2	-	47	2	1	-
Other												

with social science orientations. In economics, a review book, Economics by Antell was often noted and reported to be used in many classrooms. Psychology, popular in many high schools, was represented by a very fragmented collection of materials and texts, only one of which was used more than any others, Psychology Today's (CRM) introductory text. The teacher-initiated list was very fragmented in the sense that no one text or program was familiar to or used by, even a significant minority of the group. Except for extensive awareness of Fenton's work and a few introductory texts, virtually no programs, either those developed under NSF or through other auspices, were reported to be in regular use. Apparently, most of the teachers in the group instruct from one or more texts, from notes and/or curriculum guides, or develop their own eclectic collection of lessons for a social science course. This finding is all the more striking since at least half of the group reported having taught a social science course or elective at some time in their recent careers. In short, the group offered fertile territory for dissemination of information, materials, and ideas about social science methods and materials.

Considering that the survey at the beginning of the Workshop (table 1) showed teachers possessing little familiarity with any of the major social science programs developed with NSF backing, the same survey administered at the course's conclusion (see Table 2 for statistics) on the next page, demonstrated

TABLE 2

FAMILIARITY WITH PRE-COLLEGE SOCIAL SCIENCE MATERIALS

Post-Workshop Survey

N=47 (responses in numbers of teachers)

Subjects & Programs	Degree of Awareness ("heard of, seen")				Degree of Familiarity ("Read, examined")				Degree of Use ("in class")			
	NONE	SLIGHT	SOMEWHAT	VERY	NONE	SLIGHT	SOMEWHAT	VERY	NONE	SLIGHT	SOMEWHAT	VERY
Anthropology												
"Anthropology Curriculum Study"	8	26	13	-	8	26	13	-	30	9	8	-
"Exploring Human Nature"	5	15	21	6	5	18	22	?	28	17	2	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economics												
"Economics in Society"	8	31	7	1	8	33	5	1	42	2	2	1
"Topics in Economics (JCCE)"	6	31	7	2	6	31	9	1	35	6	6	-
Other	-	3	12	5	-	3	12	5	-	6	10	4
Political Science												
"American Political Behavior"	6	18	18	5	6	21	20	-	16	21	8	2
"Comparing Political Experience"	10	33	4	-	10	35	2	-	41	6	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Psychology												
"Introduction to Psychology"	12	33	1	1	12	33	1	1	40	4	2	1
"Psychology: A Short Course"	9	25	8	5	9	26	9	3	34	10	2	1
Other	-	11	9	7	-	11	10	6	-	10	2	1
Sociology												
"Sociological Resources for the Social Studies"	6	20	18	3	6	23	15	3	21	15	8	3
a. "Inquiries in Sociol Sociology"	11	24	10	2	11	25	9	1	31	12	4	-
b. "Episodes in Sociology"	7	21	15	4	7	23	13	4	21	14	8	4
Other												

significant though by no means universal, changes in awareness, familiarity, and reported usage. Each of the programs demonstrated and discussed at workshop meetings was recalled by a majority of participants on their survey form. Most reported a shift in awareness from "more" to "slight" or to "somewhat" for all of the programs examined. Relatively few indicated that they felt very aware of or familiar with the curriculum materials that formed the basis of the workshop. This is probably a function of the limited time given to each program and to the time lag involved in teacher attempts to use new materials in their own classrooms.

Expressions of familiarity showed a shift similar to that of awareness with a movement out of the null category and into the "slight" or "somewhat" response levels. Again, relatively few indicated great familiarity with any of the individual programs or with a group of the materials in any one social science field of study.

It should be noted, however, that several curricula had a much stronger impact on teachers' awareness and familiarity than others including the Episodes from the SRSS package, American Political Behavior, and Exploring Human Nature. Perhaps these were better explored in class or have greater appeal to most social studies teachers' history orientations. EHN was recalled partly because the films that are part of the

program made a lasting impression. APB was remembered because partly because teachers reported enjoying the workbook activities that go with the text- and frequently indicated an intention to use them in class.

In terms of use, there was a sharp drop in the rate of shift from none to "slight" or "somewhat". Much greater awareness and familiarity was reported than use, although quite a few indicated moderate usage of APB, the SRSS Episodes, and Psychology: A Short Course. A handful of teachers indicated great involvement with one or more of the programs, having adopted them as their standard or mainstay texts for classroom use. The relatively slow shift toward use of curriculum materials may be due to several factors: first, the workshop itself has just concluded; second, a classroom opportunity to use a new program may not occur within so brief a period as a year; third, inertia to change or worries of insufficient knowledge and or training to competently implement a new course; and fourth; lack of administrative support or fear of official disapproval, real or imagined.

Changing teacher's behavior patterns and curriculum choices is a difficult business, even given a relatively strong, year-long workshop effort which was moderately successful in developing considerable awareness of, and familiarity with major social science programs that could serve as alternatives to existing course outlines or could supplement current teacher efforts.

C. FOLLOW UP RESULTS

Of the forty-seven Information Dissemination Workshop in the Social Sciences (IDWSS) participants, nineteen participated in a telephone and or classroom follow-up interview on June 12th and 13th, 1980, a total of forty per cent. With only two exceptions, these individuals returned calls placed to them at their department offices at the school in which they were teaching. Twenty-seven successful calls were made to randomly-chosen participants in an attempt to sample fifty per cent of the original group. Thus, seventy per cent of the number contacted were eventually interviewed.*

The number of participants interviewed might well have run higher under other circumstances; June 12 and 13 were the last school days of 1980. Teachers were harrassed and hurried on these days, yet they often made what seemed to be extraordinary efforts to complete the interview. In two cases, this meant making two separate phone calls. Some teachers called the interviewer in the evening from their homes. One placed her call from a pay phone beside a busy expressway after working hours. Six were interviewed and observed in class.

Those who were interviewed were without exception enthusiastic about the IDWSS Program. It is tempting under these circumstances to conclude that, had there been more time for interviews, the number completed and favorable would have been much higher. However, it is possible that only those expressing a high degree of satisfaction would respond under the conditions of a telephone interview such as this one. Thus these results may represent a biased sample of respondents. That there may have been such a pattern of response should be borne in mind when reviewing the following generally laudatory results.

---

* Thirty-six calls were actually made. Nine of these were not successful in that the teachers called had moved to another school, gone on sabbatical, or were otherwise not available.

There were twenty-seven male and sixteen female participants in the IDWSS Project; ten male and nine female participants were interviewed. Most taught in a public high school; only two had positions in a private or parochial school. It is difficult to present their grade level(s) in a tabular fashion because of the many cases in which teachers taught a number of grades; these were in overlapping, non-uniform combinations. Only six taught the upper grades (11-12) exclusively. Of the fifteen who taught in the lower grades (7,8,9), eight taught only a lower grade or grades, and seven taught a lower grade in combination with a higher grade or grades. Two department chairpersons were included in this sample, and two teachers from a discipline other than Social Studies (English). One teacher taught in an ungraded high school for learning and emotionally-disabled children.

The Interview

The first question of the interview proper asked:

1. Have you taught a social science elective in the last two years? If so, what discipline?

This sample answered:

Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
3	2	3	11

but some had taught more than one elective:

Economics	4
Law	3
Psychology	3
Ethnic/ Black Studies	2
Anthropology	1
Sociology	1
Women's Studies	1

Of those who answered "Never," four specifically related this answer to their teaching only grade 8 or 9, where they did not have the opportunity to teach electives at all.

Several teachers, though not now teaching

any elective, spoke fondly of times past when they had been able to teach such a course--in another school, perhaps, or at another grade level.

Participants were asked:

Do you incorporate the social sciences into your social studies courses?

They answered:

Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
12	4	2	0

Respondents who answered "Seldom" were not regular Social Studies teachers. One was the Special Education teacher, one an English teacher who drew from the social sciences for drama background and context. The other English teacher, however, answered "regularly," indicating a particular relevance of the social sciences for literature studies.

Participants were asked if they were familiar with various social science projects or area texts, and whether they had used them, either in class work or as their own source material. They answered as follows:

	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Slightly Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Used
Sociological Resources for the Social Sciences	2	2	6	10	2
Exploring Human Nature	1	2	9	7	2
Economics in Society	1	2	3	13	3
American Political Behavior	4	5	5	5	4
Comparing Political Experiences	0	4	3	12	2

<u>American Political Behavior</u> is the clear leader here, if both

teacher familiarity and actual use are considered. Both it and Exploring Human Nature are known to participants in that more than 50% of the interviewed teachers were to some extent, even if only slightly, familiar with them.

When they were asked if they were familiar with a secondary text in three areas of the social sciences, from 36% to 68% of the sample answered that they were:

	Yes	No
Secondary Sociology Text	9	10
Secondary Psychology Text	7	12
Secondary Economics Text	13	6

The following secondary texts were named or identified by author or by series:

Sociology

Asian Studies (Fenton) 1
Inquiries in Sociology (Am. Soc. Assoc.) 1
Today's Society (Sankowsky) 1
The Way of Man (Broom and Selznick) 1
World Cultures (Steeg) 1

Psychology

Living Psychology (Hershey) 2
Understanding Psychology (Wertheimer) 2
Workbook (for above) (Kimball and Germezy) 1
Introduction to Behavioral Science (Fenton) 1
Introduction to Psychology 1
SRA Series 1

Economics

Economics for Everyone (Gordon and Withell) 5
The Worldly Philosophers (Heilbroner) 3
Comparative Economic Systems (Fenton) 2
Economics (Samuelson) 2

(Economics)
Economics for Young People 2
Study Guide (Antell) 2
Basic Economics (Dolan) 1
Economics for Today (Weidenaar) 1
Economics in Society (NSF) 1
The Making of an Economist 1
To Buy or Not to Buy (Nader) 1
Linder 1
MacDonald 1
New York Times Pamphlets 1

A number of teachers were not able to name texts specifically by title or author; yet they had familiarity with a text from reading it or even working with it in their classes. Often this frustrated teachers, as they seemed to search though memory for an elusive name. One teacher could remember a "yellow book," but no more, as she stood talking on the telephone in the middle of a busy office. Clearly accuracy and completeness would have been better served by allowing teachers to complete a questionnaire with pencil and paper in hand in close proximity to their libraries. On the other hand, these are selections which teachers remembered spontaneously; they were not dredged up from an unused bibliography or remote bookshelf.

Some teachers who could not recall utilizing a secondary text in these areas nevertheless indicated that they did refer to the introductory texts they had themselves used in college. Perhaps familiarity made these materials more useful to them, or perhaps these materials were available to them when others were not.

When asked whether they had ever personally taught any of the materials which were presented and examined in the IDWSS Program, only one out of the nineteen respondents said they had not. Eighteen teachers emphatically said that they had, usually giving more than one example. Some teachers gave just the general area or discipline of the material they found relevant to their teaching. These are presented first.

IDWSS Materials Personally Taught

Sociology 5
Anthropology 5
Economics 4
Psychology 2

Four Stor: s; Political Systems 4
The Family 4
Demographic Data 4
Sex Roles 2
Values (Baskin) 2
Maps 2
Law and Crime 2
Immigration 2
Supply and Demand 2
Why Leaders Elected 2
Political Polls/Survey 2
Graphs 2
Adolescents in Society 1
Map Drawing 1
Petrocycle 1

Some of these items may well overlap and describe the same material. In describing a unit of study, different teachers described different aspects of the unit, and in differing ways. Their focus often reflected what element(s) in the unit had been useful or interesting to them or useful in their classes. It seemed important not to condense this list any further, since in doing so the expression of characteristics teachers found valuable would be lost.

This was the interview question which elicited the most response from teachers. Often they would describe in detail how a unit of instruction was used and in what context it applied to the subject they were presenting, particularly if its use seemed novel or unusual.

Participants were next asked whether they had taught a special social science program, publicly or privately developed, in their classroom since the IDWSS Workshop. Here again, teachers were eager to tell of their own creative efforts and their attempts to incorporate IDW materials into their curricula. If we count those two teachers who had constructed their own regular 7-8th and 9th grade courses, 13 of the 19 in this sample replied that they had taught such a program. Only six had not.

The nature and variety of their efforts is impressive. Programs were developed in the following areas:

Bilingual Interdisciplinary Social Science (topical)
Criminal Law
Economics
Interdisciplinary Behavioral Science
Interdisciplinary Social Science/English
Multi-Ethnic Studies
Ninth Grade Social Studies
Research in Social Science
Resource Center
Seventh-Eighth Grade Social Studies
Urban Planning
Values Clarification
Women in America

In answering this question, teachers displayed much self-direction and highly creative and individual ideas about the content of their selected areas of concentration. One course which began as a course in varied social science issues proceeded, through students' selection and guided research on controversial topics, to become a course essentially in the research methods utilized by the social sciences. A ninth grade course dealt with the family, women, sex roles, and childrearing. An urban planning course covered issues of responsibility for urban problems, ways to alleviate them, economic conditions, finances, and a discussion of tax bases. A behavioral science course began by covering anthropology, sociology, and psychology, and has now expanded and developed into a full year course in each

of these areas.

Teachers in this sample were asked if they had changed their teaching style in the last two years. Thirteen replied that yes, they had. Five had not, but four of these added that they had already changed their style, usually in response to a previous workshop. The following are ways in which they felt they had changed:

More inquiry 8
More variety/ extra activities 7
Less use of authority 4
More student involvement, discussion 4
Less concern with formal curriculum 3
More small group approach 3
More student oriented 3
Individual projects/instruction 2
More problem solving 1
Use of contracts 1
Feel more competent 1
Feel more support,acceptance 1

The inquiry method of teaching is notable for its frequency of mention. Several teachers who stated they had "already changed" their teaching style (and thus are not represented here) named inquiry as the principal way in which they had changed.

When asked whether the workshop was an influence on them and their teaching, fifteen teachers responded in the affirmative. Two teachers responded that it had influenced them only slightly, and two not at all. (One of these said that he was "doing it anyway.") Six respondents cited awareness and interactions with colleagues as major influences. To know that others were teaching in this innovative and somewhat risky way, too, and to feel their support and share experiences with them, were central to these teachers' appreciation of the workshops. Several teachers said that they had been inspired by this program to develop their own programs including

other teachers in their schools.

A small number of additional comments were added after the interview per se was over. These were diverse:

I expected more curriculum materials.

Improve the advertising bulletin; make it more attractive.

There was not enough time for each discipline.

and included a few spontaneous rave reviews:

This was better than the Philosophy in the Classroom Program.

I didn't miss once.

If there were a program like this every term, I'd stay in teaching.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on both survey and follow-up results, it seems clear that the Queens College Workshop in the Social Sciences for Secondary school teachers and administrators did have a significant impact in changing the participants' level of awareness and degree of familiarity with major curriculum projects any of which could serve as the material for an anthropology, psychology, sociology, economics, or political science course. Familiarity and awareness are, however, no guarantee of classroom implementation, at least within the first year of the workshop. Follow-up interviews and observations conducted by a trained researcher showed that, at least a majority of the sub-sample perceived an impact upon their teaching methodology and curriculum choices. Some indicated only quantitative changes while others reported what they felt were qualitative changes in their teaching both in terms of content and process. As in the workshop survey results, certain projects and materials, most notably American Political Behavior and Exploring Human Nature. Most striking perhaps was the report that only one out of nineteen had not "used" one or more pieces or lessons demonstrated in the workshop. This represents a proportional increase in use over what was reported on the post-workshop survey. If true, then it appears that teachers must proceed slowly and carefully through awareness and familiarity after which use of a new curriculum or text is attempted and then finally integrated into daily lessons. Also interesting is the follow-up report's findings that a high proportion of the sub-sample incorporated "some" social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

science in their courses and that a large segment were familiar with one or more social science texts in psychology, economics, and sociology. While the level of use is still low when compared with awareness, it is encouraging to find that a workshop's impact may have increased over time through a slow absorption of new ideas, techniques, and materials by teachers and administrators--an increase in classroom experimentation even though no longer in regular contact with the original source of awareness and familiarity. Change did occur including the use of social science programs, concepts, and methods in the social studies, though it proceeded slowly and held on in the New York example that served as the subject of this report to the National Science Foundation.

Follow-up Interview

NSF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION WORKSHOP
IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Date_____

Name_____ Grade(s)_____

1. Have you taught a social science elective in the last two years?

   ( ) Regularly ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) Never

   If so, which discipline?_____

2. Do you incorporate the social sciences into your social studies courses?

   ( ) Regularly ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) Never

3. How familiar are you with these Social science projects and/or area texts: Used?

   a. Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (SRSS)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   b. Exploring Human Nature (EHN)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   c. Economics in Society (EIS)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   d. American Political Behavior (APB)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   e. Comparing Political Experiences (CPE)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

4. Are you familiar with a secondary sociology text? (Title, Author)

   _____(V)(S)(S)(N)____

5. A secondary psychology text?

   _____(V)(S)(S)(N)____

6. A secondary economics text?

   _____(V)(S)(S)(N)____

7. Have you ever personally taught any of the materials that were examined in the NSF Workshop?_____

Please describe_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Have you ever taught a special social science program, publicly or privately developed, in your classroom since then?

Describe_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Have you changed your teaching style in the last two years?_____

How/Why not?_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Was the NSF Workshop an influence or not?_____

_____

_____

_____

Follow-up Interview

NSF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION WORKSHOP
IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Date_____

Name_____ Grade(s)_____

1. Have you taught a social science elective in the last two years?

   ( ) Regularly ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) Never

   If so, which discipline?_____

2. Do you incorporate the social sciences into your social studies courses?

   ( ) Regularly ( ) Sometimes ( ) Seldom ( ) Never

3. How familiar are you with these Social science projects and/or area texts: Used?

   a. Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (SRSS)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   b. Exploring Human Nature (EHN)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   c. Economics in Society (EIS)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   d. American Political Behavior (APB)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

   e. Comparing Political Experiences (CPE)

      ( ) Very ( ) Somewhat ( ) Slightly ( ) Not at all ____

4. Are you familiar with a secondary sociology text? (Title, Author)

   _____(V)(S)(S)(N)____

5. A secondary psychology text?

   _____(V)(S)(S)(N)____

6. A secondary economics text?

   _____(V)(S)(S)(N)____

7. Have you ever personally taught any of the materials that were examined in the NSF Workshop?_____

Please describe_____

8. Have you ever taught a special social science program, publicly or privately developed, in your classroom since then?

Describe_____

9. Have you changed your teaching style in the last two years?_____

How/Why not?_____

10. Was the NSF Workshop an influence or not?_____